NOVEMBER 1956
VOL. V No. 8

TAXON

Official News Bulletin of the International Association for Plant Taxonomy, Edited and Published for I.A.P.T. by the International Bureau for Plant Taxonomy and Nomenclature, 106 Lange Nieuwstraat, Utrecht, Netherlands

ILLEGITIMACY AND VALID PUBLICATION

R. Ross (London) and F. A. Stafleu (Utrecht)

Whilst Furtado in his recent contribution to this journal (5 : 149. 1956) misinterprets the Code in some respects, he also points to one of its current weaknesses. It seems to us therefore that his remarks call for some comment lest, on the one hand, they mislead or, on the other, his misinterpretations disguise the validity of some of his suggestions. On the question of the legitimacy or illegitimacy of names not validly published, one of us (Ross, Taxon 5: 41. 1956) has already pointed out that the Note to Art. 6 (Stockholm Code, 10) settles the matter.

This Note reads: "In this Code, unless otherwise indicated, the word "name" means a name that has been *validly* published, whether it is *legitimate* or *illegitimate*" (italics ours).

As a result of this Note names not validly published are not, unless otherwise indicated, included within the connotation of the word "name" where it occurs in the Code. Since epithets are parts of names, this obviously applies also to them, but it would perhaps make for clarity if the Note expressly said so. Although Furtado mentions this Note, he has ignored it in his discussion of the definition of an illegitimate name in Art. 6 (Stockholm Code, 10) and in his analysis of Stockholm Code, Art. 73*, and this neglect vitiates his arguments based on these Articles. This is also true of the part of his argument based on Arts. 78 and 79. Although, as we explain below, we agree with Furtado that the provisions of these Articles need to be amended, the names and epithets to which they apply are only those which satisfy the conditions of valid publication as set out in the Code.

The fact that in Article 11 (Stockholm Code, 16) for didactical reasons only, the tautonymous expression "legitimate epithet or epithets validly published with the same rank" is found, cannot be quoted to support Furtado's contention that a name not validly published can be legitimate or illegitimate. The use here of "validly" before published is legalistically speaking superfluous, but in this important place it makes for greater clarity. The further fact that our living Homer of Nomenclature has once been caught nodding (even in Taxon) only goes to justify the rightness of the expression; it carries no weight against the basic provision of the above-mentioned note.

Furtado's classification of names into valid, priorable, and legitimate was the basis of one of the major changes which resulted in the Stockholm Code being

*) The Section of the Stockholm Code containing Arts. 72-81 has been considerably re-arranged in the new Code and it would be confusing to indicate the correspondence between the two Codes until the new one is published.

COMMONWEALTH ... 1 NOV 1956

a great improvement on its predecessors, and botanical taxonomists are greatly indebted to him for this. This classification was written into the Stockholm Code, but with an altered terminology (cf. Art. 6 = Stockholm Code, 10). The correspondence is as follows:

Furtado	*Code*
valid	validly published
or rather	
valid name	name (unless otherwise indicated)
priorable	legitimate
impriorable	illegitimate
legitimate	correct
illegitimate	incorrect

The terminology of the Code is an improvement over that of Furtado since it takes account of the fact that any name that is legitimate (= priorable of Furtado) can be correct (= legitimate of Furtado) if a particular taxonomic opinion is adopted. The tea plant may be taken as an example. Nothing in the Code tells you whether it is correct to call it *Thea sinensis* L. or *Camellia sinensis* (L.) O. Kuntze. It depends upon whether you regard *Thea sinensis* L. and *Camellia japonica* L. as belonging to the same genus or to two separate genera. If you place them both in the same genus, the Code tells you that you call the tea plant *Camellia sinensis* (L.) O. Kuntze; if you place them in different genera, the Code tells you that you call it *Thea sinensis* L. Either name can be used without contravening any rule, so it is proper to call both legitimate, and undesirable as well as unnecessary to coin such a term as priorable.

When Art. 6 (Stockholm Code, 10) was adopted by the Stockholm Congress, the Editorial Committee was instructed to see that the words "validly published", "legitimate", and "correct", and their antonyms, were used in the Code in accordance with the definitions contained in that Article, and were given authority to make any changes necessary to effect this. This they accomplished in most cases but, as Furtado points out, they failed to deal properly with Arts. 78 and 79 (also 80) of the Stockholm Code. What are stated in these Articles to be illegitimate names should have been given the same status as names not validly published, which do not have any part in botanical nomenclature. As it is, if interpreted strictly, specific epithets published under *Uva ursi* Mill. must, under Art. 70, Note 3 (Stockholm Code, 73, 3rd. para.) be taken into account for purposes of priority, and *Abutilon album* Hill would render illegitimate as a later homonym any subsequently published *Abutilon album.*

Unfortunately no-one appears to have detected this error of drafting before 1954, and no proposals to deal with it were made to the Paris Congress. It was considered by the Editorial Committee appointed by that Congress, but they considered themselves bound by the tacit acceptance that these provisions of the Stockholm Code had received there. Consequently they will be found unchanged in effect in Arts. 68, 70, and 71 of the new edition of the Code. As a result of the re-arrangement of the Section of the Code dealing with the rejection of names, the provisions of Arts. 78, 79, and 80 of the Stockholm Code are now combined with others in which the word "illegitimate" is correctly used. The names to which the following provisions of the new edition apply should not be described as illegitimate:

Art. 68, (Stockholm Code, 78; cases such as *Anonymos, Radicula, Leptostachys* and *Uva ursi*).

Art. 69 (3), (epithets of subdivisions of genera formed by attaching *Eu-* to the generic name).

Art. 70 (2), (3), (4), (5), (Stockholm, Code 79; e.g. cases such as *Linaria linaria* and *Abutilon album*).

Art. 71, (Stockholm Code, 80; epithets such as *typicus*, etc.).

Instead, names which contravene these provisions should be treated like names not validly published and have no status under the Code.

Since what is objectionable in these cases is not the manner of publication of the name but its form, its seems to us that the appropriate place for such provisions is Chapter III, Sections 4-6 (Arts. 20-27 = Stockholm Code, 30-37). We intend to table proposals to that effect in due course.

AN ANDROPOGONEAE GARDEN IN OKLAHOMA

Robert P. Celarier and Jack R. Harlan*

During the past five years the Oklahoma Agricultural Experiment Station has made a concentrated effort to establish an experimental garden of native and introduced grasses of the tribe Andropogoneae as a significant part of the pasture improvement program.

The uses of such a garden are numerous, among the most important being the analysis of potential germ plasm for a breeding program, and the immediate utilization of certain phenotypes of superior quality for given conditions in our pastures and ranges. Although the potentials of such a garden have long been recognized in plant improvement programs, the establishment and maintenance of such programs are laborious and costly and the full utilization of the techniqne is rarely made, except for major crops.

The problems of major interest to the plant breeder (extremes in which gene exchanges may be made, the ease of making these gene exchanges, and the morphological, cytological, and physiological variation within these extremes) are quite frequently problems of considerable importance to experimental taxonomists and evolutionists. Breeding programs of the sort here described should be of much interest to taxonomists and evolutionists. This report will deal principally with those phases of our program that have a bearing, either directly or indirectly, on taxonomy and evolution.

The success of the entire program in the Andropogoneae will depend in large measure on the efforts and assistance of the following co-workers, Louis E. Hawkins, Director of the Agricultural Experiment Station, Walter W. Hansen, Head, Department of Botany and Plant Pathology, W. L. Richardson, legume breeder, Charles E. Denman, grass breeder, Myron G. Grennell, seed technologist and Mrs. Margaret Brooks, research assistant.

---

*) Address: ROBERT P. CELARIER, Department of Botany & Pl. Path., Okla. Agric. Exp. Station, Oklahoma A. and M. College, Stillwater, Oklahoma, U.S.A.

JACK R. HARLAN, Field Crops Research Branch, Agricultural Research Service, U.S. Dept. of Agriculture, Agronomy Department Okla. Agric. Exp. Station, Oklahoma A. and M. College, Stillwater, Oklahoma, U.S.A.

The general procedures for handling materials for our experimental garden are as follows: seed are germinated under conditions of controlled temperature, light, and humidity. As they germinate and are still very small, the sprouted seeds are transferred singly to individual plant bands of 1½″ × 1½″ × 4″ dimensions containing a coarse textured soil in a flat. The flats when filled are placed in the greenhouse and are left there until the plants are at least 5-6 inches in height. Some time after this the materials are all space transplanted in the nursery garden. The garden itself consists of several rather uniform blocks of land on the Agronomy farm and are so arranged that the rows contain 20-25 plants. These blocks are irrigated more or less regularly.

By this procedure one may feel reasonably sure that each clump of plant material contains only one genotype. Also, since the garden conditions are fairly uniform and since all materials are handled similarly it seems very likely that the variation found between accessions are mostly due to real genetic differences.

Two principal types of studies are being undertaken that deal with the topics considered.

I. One study is concerned primarily with the overall picture of the Andropogoneae and the studies made are more comparative than detailed. In this we are attempting to grow at least some representatives of all the genera of the Andropogoneae. Since we are now decided that the Maydeae represents a group of close affinity to the Andropogoneae they are also included.

Six to ten herbarium specimens are taken from all accessions and many of the comparative morphological studies are made from these specimens. Once a particular study has been completed the specimens are deposited in the following herbaria: Smithsonian Institution Herbarium, Washington, D.C.; Royal Botanic Gardens Herbarium, Kew, England; Missouri Botanical Garden Herbarium, St. Louis, Missouri; University of California Herbarium, Berkeley, California; University of Pretoria Herbarium, Pretoria, South Africa.

In addition to the morphological studies of the specimens, brief field notes are taken concerning general growth type, time of flowering, winter hardiness, and several agronomic characteristics. Much of this information is, in general, physiological and several problems concerning comparative physiology could be made from this nursery.

Also, cytological studies of the meiotic chromosome behavior are made for all accessions. From these studies basic chromosome numbers and some information concerning the degree and types of polyploidy are ascertained.

The principal result of these studies is a cytotaxonomic survey of the Andropogoneae. The first of a series of reports is now in press and the second is in manuscript. It is already obvious that several genera, especially *Dimeria* R. Br., *Ischaemum* Linn., and *Andropogon* Linn. are in need of a much more detailed study.

A study of the comparative anatomy of these materials should prove interesting and a beginning has been made by H. C. Reynolds at the University of Nebraska. This study deals principally with leaf vascularization patterns and amounts of lignification. We will be happy to furnish materials for other studies.

II. The second phase of work involves a more detailed study of species relationship in selected genera and generic complexes. There are two groups now receiving concentrated attention.

1. *Amphilophiastrae*

Included in this generic complex are *Bothriochloa* O. Kuntze, *Dichanthium* Willemet, *Capillipedium* Stapf, *Eremopogon* Stapf, and *Euclasta* Franch. The generic

status of these materials is still an open question and the differentiation of the species presents a difficult problem at several points. The present objective is to study all of the species of these five genera and to sample as completely as possible the entire geographical range of their distribution.

Several species have already been analyzed in some detail and the study of one, *B. ischaemum* Keng, has been more or less completed. From these preliminary studies several lines of investigation were suggested, some of which shall be undertaken. One suggestion is that the *B. intermedia* complex, with a distribution from West Africa to Australia, may have introduced some germ plasm into the oriental variety of *B. ischaemum* and also the allied genus *Capillipedium*. Consequently, this species is now under intensive investigation but our collections are still inadequate especially from South-east Asia and Indonesia.

In at least two cases, where species differentiation is extremely difficult there is some evidence suggesting the taxa involve different polyploid levels. With the knowledge of such a reproductive isolating mechanism it may be possible to establish better morphological separation than previously.

Also, an attempt is being made to find positive correlations between polyploid levels and readily available herbarium characters. If such correlations can be found they will be very useful for monographing the group.

Preliminary investigations suggest a polyploid complex in the evolution of some of the species and it also seems likely that apomixis is widespread in the group. This last problem is of much concern to breeders and evolutionists alike and with the cooperation of Walter V. Brown of the University of Texas an embryological study of the agamic complex is being initiated.

Controlled hybridizations between varieties, species, and genera are being attempted on a rather large scale, and it is hoped that this will be of great assistance in solving the problems of relationship. Even among the apomictic forms, pollen compatability or ability of pollen to stimulate seed formation may provide evidence on relative affinity.

2. *Sorghum* section *Eu-sorghum*

Although much work has been done with this genus it is still inadequately known and certain geographical areas, such as Southeast Asia, need to be much more extensively sampled.

Our present program involves accumulating as many accessions as possible in order to analyze in a preliminary way the morphological variability of the section.

Hybridizations are also being made between the $2n = 20$ *S. propinquum* Hitchc. and several of the $2n = 20$ forage type sorghums, and several $2n = 40$ types from India with one another and the $2n = 40$ *S. halepense* Pers. of the Mediterranean type.

Any program such as this, where an attempt is made to maintain a living herbarium of materials from throughout the world, is obviously dependent on the good will and cooperation of numerous foreign colleagues.

In this regard the authors have maintained a somewhat active correspondence with approximately 400 workers from throughout the world. The responses of these scientists to our requests have been varied but for the most part they have been extremely generous with their time and patience. They have supplied not only seed and their own first-hand knowledge of the Andropogoneae in their area, but they have also suggested several problems in the tribe where work is badly needed. *It is*

not possible for us to ever adequately thank these men but we believe that most of them realize our indebtedness.

Despite the large number of contacts that we have made and the excellent response of these men *there are still large geographical areas that are extremely deficient in our collections, and this portion of the report is an appeal for assistance in completing our collections.*

The areas in which collections are most needed are:

1. *Southeast Asia* — we include in this area Assam, Burma, Thailand, Laos, Cambodia, Viet Nam, and southern China.

2. *Indonesia, Philippines* and *New Guinea* — this and area 1 are locations that are apparently rich in the Andropogoneae but which are poorly represented in our nursery. We feel that this is especially critical since these areas are considered the centers of diversity for the entire tribe.

3. *Plateau of Iran, Western Ghats and surrounding country* — this includes almost the whole of Iran, Afghanistan, Baluchistan, Sind, much of Rajasthan, and Bombay.

4. *Parts of Africa* — most needed are collections from the Sudan, Mozambique, Madagascar, Angola and the Cameroons.

5. *Mexico, Central* and *South America*

There is much need for materials from all of these five general areas and of course additional collections from other locations are always greatly appreciated.

It is quite possible that seed salvaged from herbarium specimens will often be viable, especially if the specimens are not too old and the storage conditions are fairly good. In the past, several accessions have been obtained by this method and we will gladly attempt to germinate anything that is sent.

We will also be most happy to receive correspondence from anyone on both the matter of seed collections and for suggestions or criticisms concerning our approach to the problems.

A Few Comments on the International Code of Nomenclature for Cultivated Plants

William A. Dayton (Washington)

I have been asked by the United States Forest Service to comment on this Code. The International Code of Nomenclature for Cultivated Plants adopted at London in 1952 seems to me an admirable document, prepared with great care by two outstanding nomenclature committees. The historical introduction alone is a masterpiece of scholarly research. There are, therefore, only a few items on which I would care to comment at this time.

(1) Art. C3(iii) on the use of *cultivar*, instead of variety, for cultivated plants: It is obvious that the word *variety* is now ambiguous, applying both to a taxonomic status below that of *subspecies* and to "man-made" cultivated plants. I have never quite been able to understand the strenuous objection of U.S. Department of Agriculture people to the term *cultivar* except on the basis of long-usage by horticulturists of the term *variety* for cultivated plants and because of legalistic considerations. Certainly, in the interests of proper and adequate standardization of terminology, some such term as *cultivar* should eventually replace *variety* in horticulture. The only alternative would be the elimination of the term *variety* for wild plants. This matter requires further careful study.

(2) Art. C10 is more or less at variance with Art. C6 on priority. Priority means historical justice and only the most cogent considerations should overrule priority. Is it ethical or just, for example, for a Frenchman to develop, name, and introduce a rose and then have an American rename and sell it as "Peace"?

(3) Art. C13 — "When a *cultivar* is introduced from one country to another its name should preferably be unchanged." Note the word "preferably". See comment on Art. C14 below.

(4) Art. C14 on transliteration from languages not employing Roman alphabet. One cannot imagine European or American horticulturists approving non-transliterated "fancy" names written in Arabic, Chinese, Sanskrit, Malayan and other non-Roman letters. To avoid this as well as especially uncouth and sesquipedalian names and yet abide by the priority principle should we not list here certain definite requirements for acceptance, such as roman type, a limitation of syllables, etc.? I think the matter is worthy of additional study.

(5) Art. C16 Cultivar names preferably in quotes and with an initial capital letter: Diacritical marks in plant names should be eliminated so far as at all possible in the interests of simplicity. Certainly the quotes here should be eliminated. Attention is called to the fact that the first (1923) edition of Standardized Plant Names was formally adopted as a standard by the U.S. Department of Agriculture. In that work (as well as in the 1942 edition) all cultivar (hort. var.) names were written in roman caps and small caps. This makes a very neat appearance typographically and well sets such names off from Latin botanical names.

(6) Art. C17 provides that Latin cultivar (hort. var.) names shall appear in single quotes and perhaps in roman if the Latin name is in italic. The language of the article, seems to me, could be further clarified. The single quotes are objectionable, as indicated under comment on Art. C16 above, and I see no reason why these so-called Latin but unbotanical names should not be treated the same as other cultivar names, preferably in roman caps and small caps.

(7) Art. C23(f). I am in full personal sympathy that "names of politically conspicuous persons [are] to be avoided" in naming cultivars. The Code of botanical nomenclature also recommends that wild plants should not be named after persons who have had no previous connection with the plant. Human nature being what it is, however, I see no way of stopping the Mamie Eisenhower rose, *Wellingtonia* applied to the biggest tree in the world, the biggest waterlily named after Queen Victoria, *Carnegiea*, *Harrimanella* and other genera named after millionaire "angels" etc. The whole thing is in questionably good scientific taste, but how are you going to stop it?

(8) Art. C20(e). No credit is given to the second edition of S.P.N. for its symbol for clon (℄) but the committee suggests a revision of it which seems to me typographically inferior as, unless lines are sufficiently leaded, the lower part of the L would drop down into the line below.

(9) Art. C34 says that the Code may be "modified and revised only by the joint action of competent persons officially convened at an International Horticultural Congress. . . ." Presumably such congresses would be composed of delegates *officially* selected or elected to represent certain *officially* designated agencies and organizations. Does this language possibly imply that some of these delegates are "competent" and some perhaps questionably so? Is there an internal body set up to determine competence, such as a licensing board for physicians, barristers and chiropodists? The insertion of this word "competent" puzzles me; is this the fault of myself alone?

NOMENCLATURAL NOTES ON GENERA OF LIVING GYMNOSPERMS

Rudolf Florin (Stockholm)

In connection with the treatment of the living gymnosperms for the Index Nominum Genericorum, the advance publication of the following notes and proposals has been found expedient and partly necessary.

1. Invalid generic names.

The generic names enumerated below are not considered to be validly published:

Abela R. A. Salisbury, Journ. Sc. Arts 2 : 312. 1817. (Art. 48*).

Americus Anonymus, Descr. Great Tree Sierra Nevada, Calif. 6. 1854. (Art. 5; etiam vide Rousseau, Taxon 4 : 40. 1955).

Arthrozamia Reichenbach, Consp. Regni Veget. 40. 1828. (Art. 48.)

Brownetera L. C. Richard, Ann. Mus. Hist. Nat. Paris 16 : 297, 299. 1810. (Art. 43,3.)

Cembra Opiz, Sezn. Rostl. Kvet. Ceské 27. 1852. (Art. 48.)

Chamaepeuce Zuccarini ex Endlicher, Enchirid. Bot. 139. 1841. (Art. 48.)

Chuniotsuga Cheng ex Ho, Quart. Journ. Taiwan Mus. 2(1) : 36. 1949 (Art. 46.)

Condylocarpus R. A. Salisbury ex A.B. Lambert, Descr. Gen. Pinus, ed. 8vo. 2 : 129. 1832. (Art. 46.)

× *Cupressocyparis* Dallimore in Forestry 11(1) : 3. 1937, in Kew Hand-list Conif. ed. 4. 37. 1938 et in Dallimore et A.B. Jackson, Handb. Conif. ed. 3. 262. 1948. (Art. 44 and 49.)

× *Cupressocyparis* M. L. Green ex Krüssmann, Nadelgehölze 107. 1955. (Art. 44 and 49.)

Cuprestellata "J. E. Nelson" ex Carrière, Traité Gén. Conif. ed. 2. 115. 1867. (Art. 46.)

Dammara Lamarck, Encycl. Méth. Bot. 2 : 259. 1786. (Art. 43,1 and 48.)

Dipsacozamia Lehmann ex Lindley, Veget. Kingd. ed. 3. 225. 1853. (Art. 48.)

Dolophyllum R. A. Salisbury, Journ. Sc. Arts 2 : 313. 1817. (Art. 43,3.)

Dombeia Raeuschel, Nomencl. Bot. ed. 3. 291, 1797. (Art. 48.)

Eriozamia hort. ex Miquel, Tijdschr. Wisen Natuurk. Wetensch. Amsterdam 2 : 298. 1849. (Art. 46.)

Fresnelia Mirbel ex L. C. Richard, Comm. Bot. Conif. Cycad. 141. 1826. (Art. 46.)

Haploxylon Komarov, Fl. Penins. Kamtsch. 1 : 103. 1927. (Art. 46.)

Juniperus-Sabina Weston, Fl. Angl. 19. 1775. (Art. 47.)

Katakidozamia hort. Haage et Schmidt ex E. Regel, Gartenflora 25 : 5. 1876. (Art. 46.)

Leichhardtia Sheperd, Cat. Pl. Cult. Sydney 15. 1851. (Art. 48.)

Nothotsuga Gaussen ex Ho, Quart. Journ. Taiwan Mus. 2(1) : 36. 1949 (Art. 46.)

Peuce L. C. Richard, Ann. Mus. Hist. Nat. Paris 16 : 298. 1810. (Art.48.)

Pinus-Abies Weston, Bot. Univ. 1 : 210. 1770. (Art. 47.)

Pinus-Larix Weston, Bot. Univ. 1 : 210. 1770. (Art. 47.)

Robertia L. C. Richard ex Carrière, Traité Gén. Conif. ed. 1. 498. 1855. (Art. 46.)

Stanggeria Stevens, Proc. Linn. Soc. London 2 : 349. 1854. (Art. 43,3.)

Taiwanites Hayata, Journ. Linn. Soc. London 37 : 330. 1906 in adnot. (Art. 48.)

× *Tsugo-Keteleeria* Campo-Duplan et Gaussen, Trav. Lab. For. Toulouse I. 4(24) : 6. 1948. (Art. 44 and 49.)

× *Tsugo-Picea* Campo-Duplan et Gaussen, Trav. Lab. For. Toulouse I. 4(24) : 8. 1948 (Art. 44 and 49.)

× *Tsugo-Picea-Picea* Campo-Duplan et Gaussen, Trav. Lab. For. Toulouse I. 4(24) : 9. 1948. (Art. 44, 49 and H. 3.)

× *Tsugo-Picea-Tsuga* Campo-Duplan et Gaussen, Trav. Lab. For. Toulouse I. 4(24): 11. 1948. (Art. 44, 49 and H. 3.)

2. Lectotypes and neotypes of some validly published genera.

a. In Engler & Prantl, Nat. Pflanzenfam. ed. 2. 13: 74, 80, 320-397. 1926, Pilger designated the "typische Art" for each of some genera of cycads and conifers. I have accepted the expression "typische Art" as meaning lectotype in the following cases:

Athrotaxis D. Don 1838: *A. selaginoides* D. Don (p. 357).

*) The numbers refer to the articles in the 'Stockholm Code' (1952).

Chamaecyparis Spach 1842: *C. sphaeroidea* (Sprengel) Spach (*Thuia sphaeroidea* Sprengel), nom. illeg. [*Cupressus thyoides* Linnaeus, *Chamaecyparis thyoides* (Linnaeus) N. L. Britton, Sterns et Poggenburg] (p. 394).

Cupressus Linnaeus 1753: *C. sempervirens* Linnaeus (p. 392).

Cycas Linnaeus 1753: *C. circinalis* Linnaeus (p. 74).

Juniperus Linnaeus 1753: *J. communis* Linnaeus (p. 397).

Larix P. Miller 1754: *L. decidua* P. Miller (p. 327).

Libocedrus Endlicher 1847: *L. doniana* (W. J. Hooker) Endlicher (*Thuja doniana* W. J. Hooker), nom. illeg. [*Dacrydium plumosum* D. Don in A. B. Lambert, *Libocedrus plumosa* (D. Don in A. B. Lambert) Sargent] (p. 389).

Macrozamia Miquel 1842: *M. spiralis* (R. A. Salisbury) Miquel (*Zamia spiralis* R. A. Salisbury) (p. 80).

Pinus Linnaeus 1753: *P. sylvestris* Linnaeus (p. 332).

Thuja Linnaeus 1753: *T. occidentalis* Linnaeus (p. 386).

Tsuga Carrière 1855: *T. sieboldii* Carrière (p. 320).

b. The following lectotypes are proposed:

Apinus Necker 1790: *Pinus cembra* Linnaeus.

Aulacophyllum E. Regel 1876: *A. skinneri* (Warszewicz in A. Dietrich) E. Regel (*Zamia skinneri* Warszewicz in A. Dietrich).

Chaetocladus J. Nelson ("Senilis") 1866: *C. distachyus* (Linnaeus) J. Nelson (*'distachys'*) (*Ephedra distachya* Linnaeus).

Cuprespinnata J. Nelson ("Senilis") 1866: *C. disticha* (Linnaeus) J. Nelson [*Cupressus disticha* Linnaeus, *Taxodium distichum* (Linnaeus) L. C. Richard].

Foetataxus J. Nelson ("Senilis") 1866: *F. montana* J. Nelson (*Taxus montana* sensu Nuttall non Willd., *Torreya montana* hort. ex Carrière pro syn., *Torreya taxifolia* Arnott).

Gigantabies J. Nelson ("Senilis") 1866: *G. taxifolia* J. Nelson [taxonomic syn. of *Sequoia sempervirens* (D. Don in A. B. Lambert) Endlicher].

Retinispora Siebold et Zuccarini 1844: *R. obtusa* Siebold et Zuccarini.

Stachycarpus (Endlicher) Van Tieghem 1891: *S. andinus* (Poeppig ex Endlicher) Van Tieghem (*'andina'*) [*Podocarpus andinus* Poeppig ex Endlicher (*'andina'*)].

c. Neotypes are proposed for two cycad generic names, viz.

Palma-Filix Adanson (? 1762) 1763: *Zamia pumila* Linnaeus.

Todda-Pana Adanson (? 1762) 1763: *Cycas circinalis* Linnaeus.

3. Unnecessary conservation of generic names.

The conservation of *Sequoia* Endlicher 1847 against *Steinhauera* Presl in Sternberg 1838 is unnecessary in consequence of Art. 68 of the Stockholm Code (pp. 38, 85. 1952).

According to Bakhuizen van den Brink Jr. (Taxon 4: 196. 1955), the conservation of *Agathis* R. A. Salisbury 1807 against *Dammara* Lamarck 1786 is unnecessary, since Lamarck's "generic" name is invalid.

4. Typification of Pherosphaera hookeriana *J. D. Hooker (non Archer) and* Diselma archeri *J. D. Hooker.*

In 1953 C. G. Elliott [Taxon, 2(6): 141] and H. N. Barber [Taxon, 2(8): 214] separately proposed the conservation of the generic name *Pherosphaera* J. D. Hooker 1857 against *Pherosphaera* Archer 1850 and *Microstrobos* J. Garden et L. S. Johnson 1950 [Contr. N. S. Wales Nat. Herb. 1(6): 315; cf. Taxon 3(5): 150. 1954]. The background of this case is the confusion arisen in the middle of the nineteenth century in respect of the identity of the mountain conifers of Tasmania. This confusion was removed in substance by J. D. Hooker in his "Flora Tasmaniae" of 1857, but his application of the generic name *Pherosphaera* and of the combination *Ph. hookeriana* J. D. Hooker 1857 (non Archer 1850) is not in accordance with the present rules of botanical nomenclature. Consequently, Garden & Johnson proposed the new generic name *Microstrobos* and substituted the specific name *niphophilus* for *hookeriana*, but Barber strongly criticized their attempt to typify *Microstrobos niphophilus* in the following manner: — "H o l o t y p e: Mountains near Lake St. Clair, R. C. Gunn (? No. 366 partim), 'Fl. Jan.' — in herbarium Kew (not seen)." When in London a short time ago for other purposes, I therefore availed myself of the opportunity kindly afforded me to look over the Tasmanian conifer material in the Kew Herbarium and the Botany Department of the British Museum (Natural History), with special regard to the specimens examined by

J. D. Hooker for his "Flora Tasmaniae".

The relevant material in the British Museum, collected by R. C. Gunn on January 7th, 1841, at Lake St. Clair and numbered 366/1842, apparently consists of duplicate specimens sent from the Kew Herbarium but not examined by J. D. Hooker. It reflects the above-mentioned confusion. Of the two sheets present, the first shows two female specimens of *Pherosphaera hookeriana* J. D. Hooker, and three specimens of *Diselma archeri* J. D. Hooker of which one is female, one male, and the third a young plant. The second sheet carries seven specimens, of which two are female *Pherosphaera hookeriana* J. D. Hooker, three are male specimens of the same conifer, and two are male *Diselma archeri*. These identifications agree with those made tentatively of most of the specimens by the late Miss L. S. Gibbs (pencil notes).

In the Kew Herbarium there are seven sheets of interest in this connection, all apparently examined by J. D. Hooker.

Pherosphaera hookeriana J. D. Hooker.

A. Three specimens:
   a. sterile young plant, ca. 3 dm high, with a transition type of foliage in the basal region; labelled 366 *Ph. hookeriana* Archer, margin of Lake St. Clair, young pl., 5/1/47;
   b. male and *c.* female specimen, both transferred from sheets in Hooker's herbarium to Sheet A, but not labelled.

B. A large, well-preserved female specimen collected by R. C. Gunn in Tasmania (probably at Lake St. Clair) but not numbered ["V. D. Land, Gunn (bis)"], and belonging to Hooker's herbarium. Drawings for J. D. Hooker's "Flora Tasmaniae" showing details of female and male cones of *Ph. hookeriana* J. D. Hooker are pasted to this Sheet B and labelled "*Pherosphaera* Archer. No number of Gunn."

C. Three specimens:
   a. female and *b.* male specimen from Hooker's herbarium, the latter with a pencil note "Tasmania, Gunn", and originally (in Hooker's herbarium) placed on the same sheet as the specimen on the above Sheet B;
   (*c.* female specimen collected by F. von Mueller on Mount Field East in 1872 and accordingly not from Hooker's collection).

Diselma archeri J. D. Hooker.

D. Two specimens collected by R. C. Gunn:
   a. female specimen labelled "366/1842, Lake St. Clair, 7/1/41";
   b. male specimen labelled "366, margin of Lake St. Clair, 5/1/47, common".

E. Five specimens collected by R. C. Gunn: *a-b* originally mounted on Sheet E; *c-e* taken from Hooker's herbarium, and only pinned to this Sheet; according to Dr. R. Melville, a small piece of paper with J. D. Hooker's drawings of branchlet tips, cone and seeds of *Diselma*, showing the three wings, is moreover pasted to it. Hooker's tentative name "*Tetraselma archeri* H.f." is pencilled on the Sheet, and "R. Gunn Esq. V.D.L. 1849" written in ink on it.
   a-b. female specimens labelled "366, *Microcachrys tetragona* (scored out in ink). Summit of the Western Mountains and Falls of Meander, 9/3/49".
   c-d. one sterile and one male specimen;
   e. female specimen labelled "366/1842, Lake St. Clair 7/1/41"; this information probably refers also to *c-d.*

F. Two specimens collected by R. C. Gunn:
   a-b. one sterile and one male specimen labelled "366, Lake St. Clair, 13/2/45".

G. Two male specimens labelled R. Gunn 366.

On strips of paper sent to J. D. Hooker with the specimens, Gunn wrote: "366/1842. Very plentiful on the Margin of Lake St. Clair, growing 15-25 feet *) high with trunks 12 to 16 inches in diameter...." — "366 is common on the Margin of Lake St. Clair growing close to and in most instances overhanging the water". The first note appears to apply to *Diselma archeri* only [cf. L. S. Gibbs, Journ. Ecol. 8(1, 2), 1920]. As said above, the material numbered 366 also contains several specimens of *Pherosphaera hookeriana* J. D. Hooker, however, a species occurring more or less mixed with *Diselma*, and believed by Gunn to belong to the same conifer. The second note is therefore probably true of both species. His number 366 moreover stands for several collections of these species made in 1841, 1845, 1847 and 1849, even in different localities, on the summit plateaux of Tasmania.

*) In his "Flora Tasmaniae", 1: 353(1857), J. D. Hooker wrote 5-15 feet which seems to be more correct.

Another factor to be considered is the difficulty to decide which of the specimens of *Pherosphaera* and *Diselma* in the Hooker herbarium are figured in his "Flora Tasmaniae" (Pl. XCIX, A-B, and Pl. XCVIII, A-B, respectively). In both cases J. D. Hooker failed to designate clearly a holotype. He wrote in respect of *Pherosphaera hookeriana* "Hab. Mountains near Lake St. Clair, *Gunn.* — (Fl. Jan.)", and in respect of *Diselma archeri* "Gunn, 366.... Hab. Lake St. Clair, Falls of the Meander, etc., ascending the Western Mountains and Mount Olympus (elev. 4500 feet) to their summits. — (Fl. Jan.)". The specimens "that were studied by the author up to the time the taxon was published and included in it when it was published" are, on the other hand, known in each case (I.C.B.N. 1952, App. I, p. 49), and a lectotype can therefore be selected to serve as nomenclatural type. As regards *Diselma,* Dr. Melville is almost certain that the top of specimen *a* on Sheet E was used for making the drawing reproduced as fig. B on Pl. XCVIII of Hooker's work, but that it has been reversed in the printing process.

In agreement with Dr. Melville the following lectotypes are proposed, viz.

for *Pherosphaera hookeriana* J. D. Hooker 1857 (non Archer 1850) (= *Microstrobos niphophilus* Garden et Johnson 1950): the female specimen fastened to the above-mentioned Sheet B in Herb. Kew. and collected by R. C. Gunn in Tasmania, in all probability at Lake St. Clair, on January 7th, 1841, and originally numbered 366/1842 (cf. the duplicate material in the British Museum); and

for *Diselma archeri* J. D. Hooker 1857: the left hand (*a*) of the two female specimens mounted on the upper part of the above-mentioned Sheet E in Herb. Kew. and labelled "366, *Microcachrys tetragona* (scored out in ink). Summit of the Western Mountains and Falls of Meander. 9/3/49".

In my opinion the generic name *Pherosphaera* J. D. Hooker (1857) should be conserved against *Pherosphaera* Archer (1850) and *Microstrobos* J. Garden et L. S. Johnson (1950). Unfortunately, the species designation *Ph. hookeriana* J. D. Hooker (non Archer) cannot be retained, however. The following new combination is therefore proposed:

Pherosphaera niphophila (Garden et Johnson) Florin, comb. nov.

P. hookeriana J. D. Hooker in Fl. Tasman. 1: 355. 1857 (non Archer).

Microstrobos niphophilus Garden et Johnson in Contr. New South Wales Nat. Herb. 1: 316. 1950.

5. The correct generic name for the northern species group of Libocedrus *Endlicher, s. lat.*

In view of differences in morphology and distribution, the genus *Libocedrus* Endlicher [type-species: *L. plumosa* (D. Don in A. B. Lambert) Sargent] has in recent years been divided into no less than five genera, one northern and four southern (Li in Journ. Arnold Arbor. 34: 17-34. 1953; Florin & Boutelje in Acta Horti Bergiani 17(2): 7-37. 1954; cf. also Boutelje in Acta Horti Bergiani 17(6): 177-216. 1955, and the references quoted in these papers). Two generic names had previously been introduced for two of the three northern species, viz. *Calocedrus* S. Kurz (Journ. of Bot. 11: 196. 1873) with *C. macrolepis* Kurz from southeastern Asia as its type, and *Heyderia* K. Koch [Dendrol. 2(2): 178. 1873] based on the Californian *L. decurrens* Torrey. Both were united with *Libocedrus* by Bentham & Hooker in 1880 [Gen. Pl. 3(1): 426].

Owing to the differences in vegetative and reproductive features, Li found it desirable to consider the northern species group generically distinct from the southern group of *Libocedrus,* s. str. Of the said two available generic names, published in the same year, he adopted *Heyderia* in preference to *Calocedrus* without having proved its earlier date of publication.

Mr. W. T. Stearn (London) has now at my request investigated the bibliographical situation in this case.

In a letter of June 20th, 1956, Mr. Stearn wrote:

"*Calocedrus* Kurz in *J. Bot.* (*London*) 11: 196 was undoubtedly published early in July 1873; this part is noted in *Bot. Zeit.* 31(29): 463 (18 July 1873). *Heyderia* K. Koch *Dendrol.* 2. ii. 179 was published at the end of 1873, apparently in November. The first record of its issue appears in the weekly Leipzig book-trade journal *Allgemeine Bibliographie für Deutschland* 1873(47): 516 (20 Nov. 1873); it is listed as a new publication in *Bot. Zeit.* 31(50): 799 (12 Dec. 1873); the *Gard. Chron.* n.s. 1: 151 (31 Jan. 1874) states that 'the second part of the second and concluding volume of Koch's *Dendrologie* is, we learn, just published'. There are thus

three independent sources of information leading to the conclusion that Koch's name was published five months or so later than Kurz's."

Mr. Stearn's result conforms to that later reached by the Bavarian State Library. At the request of Dr. H. Merxmüller (Munich) whom I had asked for assistance, Dr. Mülleroott of the said Library examined the bibliographical situation and sent Dr. Merxmüller just recently the following information (communicated to me in a letter of August 21st):

"Ich bin zunächst an den Verlag Enke herangetreten, dessen Verkaufsregister aber nur von 1880 an erhalten sind. Aber mit dem damals täglich erscheinenden Börsenblatt konnte ich den offiziellen Erscheinungstermin mit dem 12. November 1873 BBl. 1873 Nr. 262 S. 4181 feststellen. Da der Verlag Enke unter dem gleichen Termin 6 Werke ankündigte, die sicher nicht alle auf den gleichen Tag fertig wurden, erscheint es sehr gut möglich, dass Kochs Werk etwas früher vorlag, möglicherweise hat der Autor seine Exemplare schon in den letzten Oktobertagen erhalten. Aber vielleicht genügt der 12. November 1873 bereits um die Priorität der Gattung Heyderia zu entscheiden."

The above proves that *Calocedrus* is on grounds of priority the correct generic name for the northern species group of *Libocedrus*, s. lat. Its species are:

Calocedrus macrolepis Kurz in Journ. of Bot. 11: 196. 1873 (type species).

Libocedrus macrolepis (Kurz) Bentham et J. D. Hooker, Gen. Pl. 3: 426. 1880.

Heyderia macrolepis (Kurz) Li in Journ. Arnold Arbor. 34: 23. 1953.

Calocedrus formosana (Florin) Florin, comb. nov.

Libocedrus formosana Florin in Svensk Bot. Tidskr. 24: 126. 1930.

Heyderia formosana (Florin) Li in Journ. Arnold Arbor. 34: 23. 1953.

Calocedrus decurrens (Torrey) Florin, comb. nov.

Libocedrus decurrens Torrey in Smithson. Contr. Knowl. 6(1): 7. 1853.

Heyderia decurrens (Torrey) K. Koch, Dendrol. 2(2): 179. 1873.

* * *

I am indebted to Dr. R. W. Anderson, National Herbarium of New South Wales, Sydney, Professor J. Amaral do Franco, Instituto Superior de Agronomia, Lisboa, Dr. N. Hylander, University Botanical Garden, Uppsala, Dr. R. Melville, Royal Botanic Gardens, Kew, Dr. H. Merxmüller, Botanische Staatssammlung, Munich, Dr. R. Santesson, University Botanical Museum, Uppsala, Dr. F. A. Stafleu, International Bureau for Plant Taxonomy and Nomenclature, Utrecht, and Mr. W. T. Stearn, Botany Department of the British Museum (Natural History), London, for valuable assistance, suggestions and criticism. —

Hortus Bergianus, Stockholm 50, Sweden, August 1956.

NOTE ON THE GENUS GUIDONIA PLUMIER

H. Sleumer (Leiden)

During my recent work in Flacourtiaceae for the Index Nominum Genericorum I was faced with the typification of the genus *Samyda* L. This genus goes back to *Guidonia* Plumier necessitating its analysis.

Guidonia Plumier, Nov. Gen. 4: *t. 24.* 1703 contained the following 5 'species':

1. Guidonia ulmi foliis, flore roseo
2. Guidonia ulmi foliis, flore niveo
3. Guidonia aurantii foliis, aculeata
4. Guidonia nucis juglandis foliis, major
5. Guidonia nucis juglandis foliis, minor

From Plumier's manuscripts and drawings a posthumous edition was published by Burman, in which Guidonia appears in fasc. 6. 1757. Here Plumier's spp. 1 and 2 were combined into one species "Samyda foliis serratis oblongis", described on p. 137 depicted on t. 146, f. 2, Plumier's sp. 3 became "Samyda spinosa foliis ovatis denticulatis" on p. 138 and was drawn in t. 147, f. 1, and Plumier's spp. 4 and 5 were merged on p. 139 into "Samyda foliis ovatis acuminatis 4-jugis, floribus racemosis axillaribus" and figured on t. 147, f. 2.

Plumier's Guidonia is in fact a complex of three genera. This complex was handled subsequently in the following way:

Up to and including 1753 Linnaeus only evaluated Plumier's spp. 4 and 5 which are

the base of Samyda L. [Cor. 1737; Amoen. 1: 401. 1749] Sp. Pl. ed. 1: 443. 1753; Gen. ed. 5: 202. 1754. Its only species is S. guidonia L. Sp. Pl. ed. 1: 443. 1753. There is no doubt, that this 'first' Samyda of Linnaeus is identical with the Meliaceous Guarea Allem. ex L., Mant. 2: 150. 1771 and Samyda guidonia L. = Guarea trichilioides L. l.c. 228, as stated by Urban, Fedde Rep. Beih. 5: 70. 1920 *). Consequently, if it is desirable to maintain Guarea Allem. ex. L. 1771, now conserved only against Elutheria P. Browne 1756, it must also be conserved against Samyda L. 1753. This has been proposed at the end of this paper.

Guidonia Miller, Gard. Dict. Abr. ed. 4: 1754, by which Plumier's name became valid under the Code, still has Plumier's original circumscription with all the 5 'species' comprising three generical units. As Linnaeus had, in 1753, accepted Plumier's ssp. 4 and 5 as the type of his genus Samyda, there remain only Plumier's spp. 1-3 from which a lectotype of Guidonia Miller can be chosen.

Druce (Rep. Bot. Exch. Cl. Brit. Isl. 3: 432. 1913) without further detailed study simply says, that Guidonia Miller is congeneric with Casearia Jacq. without indicating a lectotype. In this he is only partly right. If we follow him, we would have to choose (Plumier's =) Miller's sp. 3 as a lectotype sp., which is t. 147. f. 1 in ed. Burman and the type of Casearia aculeata Jacq. Consequently, Casearia Jacq. 1760 would then have to be conserved against Guidonia Miller 1754. To avoid such an unnecessary procedure, I propose (Plumier's =) Miller's sp. 1 (and 2, condensed in the Burman ed. into t. 146. f. 2) as the lectotype sp. of Guidonia Miller 1754; this figure is the type of Samyda dodecandra Jacq., here proposed as the lectotype sp. of Samyda Jacq. 1760. In this way, Guidonia Miller 1754 becomes an earlier nomenclatural synonym of Samyda Jacq. 1760.

Three years after Linnaeus P. Browne (Hist. Jam. 217. 1756) understood under Samyda 3 'species' distinguished by phrases as follows:

1. S. fruticosa foliis nitidis .... t. 23. f. 3 (subsequently the type of Samyda nitida L., Syst. ed. 10: 1025. 1759 = Casearia nitida (L.) Jacq., En. Pl. Carib. 21. 1760, proposed as the lectotype sp. of the genus Casearia Jacq. by Britton & Millspaugh, Baham. Fl. 285. 1920).

2. S. foliis ovatis .... (subsequently the type of Samyda parviflora L., Syst. ed. 10: 1025. 1759, which is a Casearia).

3. S. foliis ovatis villosis .... floribus confertis, fasciculis sparsis. Samyda L. Sp. Pl. (referred in ed. Burman p. 139 to the original sp. 4 of Plumier's Guidonia which, judging from the description, is apparently wrong; in L., Syst. ed. 10: 1024. 1759 the type of Samyda guidon L.; in L., Sp. Pl. ed. 2: 557. 1762 with a question mark referred to under Samyda pubescens L. The identity of this concept has remained obscure till the present day.

From these data it is clear, that Samyda in the sense of P. Browne 1756 is not the same as Samyda L. 1753, and for its greater part belongs to Casearia Jacq.

Linnaeus continued to use the generic name Samyda in this later work, omitting consistently his own type species! In Syst. ed. 10: 1012, 1024. 1759 he gives a very short generic description of Samyda, simply basing himself completely on the 3 'species' of P. Browne:

1. S. guidon, foliis villosis Browne Jam. 218. n. 3,

2. S. parviflora, foliis ovatis glabris acuminatis. Browne Jam. 217. n. 2 *),

3. S. nitida, foliis cordatis glabris crenatis. Browne Jam. 217. n. 1.

S. guidon L. 1759 is clearly a different species from S. guidonia L. 1753; it has not been cleared up later, because of the inadequate description. S. parviflora L. and S. nitida L. both belong to Casearia Jacq. Samyda sensu Linnaeus 1759 thus had become a genus entirely different from Samyda L. 1753, and represents factually the equivalent of Casearia.

To complicate the matter, Linnaeus in the same work, Syst. ed. 10: 1382. 1759, describes Samyda Loefling, stating in the Errata, that his own ('second') Samyda on p. 1012 should be replaced by the genus Samyda Loefling. The year before, Loefling (It. 260. 1758) had published his Samyda parviflora with a fairly good description which shows that Samyda sensu Loefling is congeneric with Casearia Jacq. 1860.

The next to deal with Plumier's Guidonia-

---

*) Already recognized as Meliaceous and reduced to Mahagoni Catesb. by Adanson (Fam. 2: 343. 1763).

*) Not Samyda parviflora Loefl., It. 260. 1758 which is based on another type and bears no reference to P. Browne's n. 2.

complex was Jacquin, En. Pl. Carib. 4, 21. 1760, who divided what was left of Guidonia Plumier after Linnaeus in 1753 had segregated Plumier's spp. 4 and 5 as Samyda L., into two genera:

1. Casearia with 3 spp., one of them Casearia aculeata Jacq., based on Plumier ed. Burman t. 147. f. 1. This is sp. 3 from the original Guidonia Plumier 1703 and Miller 1754.
2. Samyda with 2 spp., one of them S. dodecandra Jacq., based on Plumier ed. Burman t. 146. f. 2, which is sp. 3 from the original Guidonia Plumier 1703 and Miller 1754. There is no reference to any of the Linnean Samydas.

Here in Jacquin's work for the first time the two genera are clearly distinguished.

Linnaeus did not accept Jacquin's segregation. In Sp. Pl. ed. 2. 557. 1762 he described Samyda as a combination of Jacquin's Samyda and Casearia, and thus in fact another ('third') Samyda, differing both from the Samyda L. 1753 and Samyda L. 1759 in circumscription. This Samyda in the sense of Linnaeus 1762 has been maintained by many subsequent older authors. The first to accept Jacquin's clear distinction of Samyda Jacq. (cited this way!) and Casearia Jacq. was Jussieu, Gen. 1789; since then Samyda has been used in the sense of Jacquin. Only Necker, Elem. 2. 1790, confused the matter as to the names: he distinguished, as did Jacquin, two genera, but named Samyda (l.c. 441) what belongs to Casearia Jacq., and created the new generic name Geunzia (l.c. 440) for what is Samyda Jacq.

It is clear that if we want to maintain the generic name Samyda, we should accept it in the sense of Jacquin who was the first to give it a clean cut description. If we do so Samyda Jacq. should be added to the list of Nomina conservanda. The reasons in favour of such a conservation are:

1. The generic name Samyda has been used since Jussieu 1789 exclusively in the sense of Jacquin 1760.
2. The generic name Samyda sensu Jacquin is connected with names of taxa of higher rank such as Samydeae Gaertn. 1805 (pro fam.) and Samydaceae Dumort. 1829, the original Samyda L. 1753 having been proved beyond doubt to belong to the Meliaceae.
3. In regard to the synonyms of Samyda Jacq.:
   a. Guidonia Adanson, Fam. 2: 305. 1763, based on Plumier ed. Burman t. 146, f. 2 (which at the same time is the base of the lectotype sp. of Samyda Jacq. proposed in this paper, hence automatically becoming a nomenclatural synonym of it) is not available, being a later homonym of Guidonia Miller 1754.
   b. Geunzia Neck., Elem. 2: 440. 1790 could replace Samyda Jacq., but no lectotype sp. is proposed nor any combinations are made up till now.
   c. Sadymia Grisebach, Fl. Br. W. Ind. Isl. 25. 1859, based on Samyda villosa SW., is an inadequately known monotypic genus, which has not been collected again.

This study has shown that in order to give a firm, adequate basis for some generic names and their typification the following two proposals appear necessary.

(17) Proposal to conserve the generic name 5337. *Samyda* in the sense of Jacquin (Flacourtiaceae):

Samyda Jacquin En. Pl. Carib. 4: 21. 1760 (nom. cons. prop.)

Lectotype sp.: S. *dodecandra* Jacq. l.c. 21.

Size and area: about 10 spp.; W. Indies.

Samyda Linnaeus, Sp. Pl. ed. 1: 443. 1753 (nom. rej. prop.)

Type sp.: S. *guidonia* L. l.c. (Meliaceae)

Size and area: 1 sp.; Trop. America.

Guidonia Miller, Gard. Dict. Abr. ed. 4. 1754 (nom. rej. prop.)

Lectotype sp.: "Guidonia ulmi foliis, flore roseo" (et niveo, Plumier ed. Burman, fasc. 6: 137. t. 146, f. 2. 1757).

(18) Proposal to conserve the generic name 4190. **Guarea** Allem. ex L., Mant. 2: 150. 1771 (nom. cons.) (Meliaceae) *also* against:

Samyda Linnaeus, Sp. Pl. ed. 1. 443. 1753 (nom. rej. prop.)

Type sp.: S. *guidonia* L. l.c. *)

Size and area: 1 sp.; Trop. America.

---

*) Samyda guidonia L. Sp. Pl. ed. 1. 443. 1753 = Guarea trichilioides L., Mant. 2: 228. 1771, cf. Urban, Fedde Rep. Beih. 5: 70. 1920 = **Guarea guidonia** (L.) Sleum. comb. nov.

THE HOLOTYPE OF HYMENOCALLIS PALMERI

Hamilton P. Traub (La Jolla, California)

In connection with the comprehensive study of the species of *Hymenocallis* Salisb., native to the southeastern United States and Mexico which has been carried on for the past two decades in cooperation with others in this country interested in this field, the available type material has been consulted whenever possible. Reports of some of these studies have been published (Traub, 1952; 1953; 1956; Traub & Vickery, 1956). The cooperation of others elsewhere who are interested in these plants would be appreciated.

The present report concerns *Hymenocallis palmeri* S. Wats., Proc. Amer. Acad. Arts & Sci. 14: 301. 1879; Forest & Garden 1: 138, fig. 25. 1888.

PRESENTATION OF DATA

The writer resided in Florida from 1930 to 1940 and he often encountered *Hymenocallis palmeri* in the wild, particularly on the west coast of peninsular Florida, from Collier to Pinellas counties. Seeds and bulbs were sent to Major Pam in England for study in the 1930's. Thus there was no question as to its existence. It remains however to correlate recently collected material with the holotype and the type description and thus to arrive at an adequate emended description.

The holotype and recent collections. The holotype of *Hymenocallis palmeri* S. Wats. is Palmer No. 554 (GH), collected at Biscayne Bay, Florida, in 1874. This was made available through the kindness of Dr. Rollins of the Gray Herbarium. This specimen agrees sufficiently with Watson's published description in which he indicated Palmer No. 554 as the type (= holotype). Any discrepancies are due to the inadequacy of the customary method of pressing and drying herbarium specimens. By this method the very delicate tepalsegs and other structures shrink considerably so that it is not possible to obtain correct measurements. The writer has prepared specimens according to the new method by which the delicate parts are preserved in a better condition (Traub, 1950; 1951). The material of *Hymenocallis palmeri* was grown from bulbs collected by Wm. Guild and Clara Adams in Pinellas County, Florida (in hort. Traub, Beltsville, Md.): 7-11-52, Traub No. 525; 8-12-52, Nos. 527 & 528; and 8-15-52, No. 526 (TRA). These specimens together with a kodachrome negative of the species in the wild, are now available for study and comparison with the holotype of *Hymenocallis palmeri.*

Emended description. In the following emended description of *Hymenocallis palmeri,* the values in parentheses are those obtained from the holotype. When these are identical with those from the recent specimens, the values are italicized. In cases where the parts are badly shrunken in the holotype so that somewhat accurate measurements are not obtainable, these obviously inaccurate values are omitted.

Bulb (1.8 cm.) long, (1 cm.) in diam., neck (1.6 cm.) long, 4.5 mm. wide. Leaves 5-7, thick textured, channeled down the upper side, dark green with lighter greenish-whitish hyaline margin, nearly linear, 23.5-32.2-(33.2)-38-39.5 cm. long, (7)-8.2-8.5-10 mm. wide at the middle, narrowing to (4)-7.5-8 mm. wide at the base, or rarely very narrowly oblanceolate 7.5 mm. wide 3/4 up from the base and narrowing to 7.5 mm. wide at the base; tapering to a roundish to acutish apex. Scape 11-16.7-19-22-(22.5) cm. tall. Spathe-valves 2, rudimentary and non-functional, (4.1-4.3)-4.5 cm. long, linear, 2 mm. wide; or lanceolate, 2.7-7 mm. wide, apex acuminate. Bracteole solitary, almost the same as the spathe-valves, apex curled. Umbel 1-flowered. Ovary sessile, flattish, 1.1-1.2-(1.6)-1.8-2.3 cm. long, (8)-8.5-8.9-9 mm. in diam; ovules 3-4-9 per locule. Perigone with tepalsegs, staminal-cup, stamens and style upright; tepaltube light greenish, tepalsegs light greenish on under side, somewhat lighter greenish on upper sides, staminal-cup and filaments white, style very light green in lower 1/2, upper half darker green. Tepaltube 6.5-(8.9)-9.2-9.5 cm. long, 5-8-8.9-9 mm. wide at the apex, narrowing somewhat toward the base. Tepalsegs 8.5-8.8-9.7-(11)-1.5 cm. long, 5.5-6.5-7-7.5 mm. wide 1/4 from the base, tapering slightly toward the base, and to the acutish apex. Staminal cup slightly tubulose at the base, margins irregularly toothed between the filaments, 2.8-3-3.2-(3.6)-3.8 cm. long, 7-8.5-8 mm. in diam. at the base, 3.2-4.2-5.5 cm. in diam. at the top. Filaments 2.7-3.2-(3.4)-3.5 cm. long; anthers 1.6 cm. long. Style shorter than the tepalsegs, but overtopping the stamens; stigma capitate.

DISCUSSION

Recently, Sealy (1954) has postulated without any supporting evidence that *H. palmeri* might have been based on *Hymenocallis rotata* (Ker-Gawl.) Herb., stating that ".... If *palmeri* does, in fact, represent a young offset from another species (and this is a matter which could be decided by observing living plants) then almost certainly that species is *H. rotata* ....". However, the writer can testify from actual observation of living plants beginning in the 1930's, and on the basis of recently preserved herbarium specimens, that *H. palmeri* is indeed one of the most distinct species in the genus and could not possibly ever under any circumstances be confused with *H. rotata* or any other plant of that character. In *H. palmeri* the leaves are narrowly linear or nearly linear, 7-10 mm. wide, the spathe is always rudimentary and does not function as a protective envelope for the immature buds, the umbel is always 1-flowered, and there are other differences, including flower color. On the basis of the characters indicated, reduction in number of flowers per umbel to one, the development of non-functional or relict spathe-valves, as shown also by parrallel evolution in *H. quitoensis* Herb. (in the subgenus *Ismene*), *H. palmeri* is one of the most recently evolved and distinct species in the sessile-leaved section of the subgenus *Hymenocallis* of the genus *Hymenocallis*.

The status of Hymenocallis humilis S. Wats. There however is a question as to the status of *H. humilis* S. Wats. (Proc. Amer. Acad. Arts & Sci. 14: 301. 1879; Garden & Forest 1: 114, fig. 23. 1888) which Watson proposed along with *H. palmeri*. Small (1933) considered *H. humilis* as conspecific with *H. palmeri*. An attempt has been made to locate the holotype of *H. humilis* S. Wats. No. 555, Indian River, Fla., 1874, which Watson presumably deposited in the Gray Herbarium, but Dr. Rollins writes that it could not be located. There is another specimen, S. Wats. No. 553, Biscayne Bay, Fla., 1874, which Dr. Rollins kindly sent for study, but this is a broader-leaved, larger-flowering plant, more than 1-flowered, and could not have been confused by Watson with either *H. palmeri* or *H. humilis* which as described are smaller and quite different plants.

It should be pointed out that on the basis of the original descriptions of these two species and the illustrations published later, Small's hypothesis that these plants are conspecific may be accepted. Watson's published data favor this procedure. The differences indicated are mainly quantitative (size). The only qualitative or character differences indicated are slight and not of sufficient importance for even varietal distinction: — staminal cup tubular-funnelform, border lobed between the stamens vs. broadly funnel-form truncate between the stamens; and ovary narrowly oblong-ovate vs. narrowly oblong. Without the holotype in hand it would be futile and misleading to speculate as to how two species could have been proposed on such slight differences. Under the circumstances, we are justified in following the lead of the late Dr. Small who considered these species conspecific. Until the holotype of *H. humilis* is located, it will not be possible to clear up this matter finally, and in the meantime, we may consider it as a smaller edition of *H. palmeri*, and the case must rest there until further evidence is at hand.

LITERATURE CITED

Sealy, J. R. Review of the genus Hymenocallis. Kew Bull. 201-240. 1954.

Small, J. K. Manual of Southeastern Flora, *H. palmeri* p. 324 (1933) pro parte.

Traub, Hamilton P. Non-moistureproof cellophane and cellophane acetate film for preserving herbarium specimens. Phytologia 3: 297-298. 1950.

—— Further notes on drying plant specimens between sheets of moisture permeable plastic films. Phytologia 3: 473-475. 1951.

—— *Hymenocallis caymanensis* Herb., Plant Life 8: 82. 1952.

—— Small's *Hymenocallis* type specimens. Plant Life 9: 70. 1953.

—— *Hymenocallis kimballiae* Small, emend. Plant Life 12: 44-46. 1956.

—— and R. K. Vickery, Jr. M. E. Jones *Hymenocallis* specimens. Plant Life 12: 43-44. 1956.

News and Notes

NOMINA CONSERVANDA PROPOSITA

(19) Proposal to conserve the generic name **Erythrospermum** Lamarck against *Pectinea* Gaertn. (*Flacourtiaceae*).

Erythrospermum Lamarck, Ill. *t. 274.* 1792; Tabl. Enc. 2(6): 407. 1819.

Lectotype sp.: *E. pyrifolium* Lamarck Ill. *t. 274. f. 1.* 1792.

Size and area: c. 6 spp. (one polymorphic); Madagascar, Mascarenes, Ceylon, Malaysia and Pacific.

Pectinea Gaertner, Fruct. 2: 136. *t. 111. f.* 3. 1791.

Type sp.: *P. zeylanica* Gaertner.

There has been no need to conserve *Erythrospermum* Lamarck as long as 1791 was considered to be the year of its publication, as is assumed in the Index Kewensis. But it is now sufficiently clear, that *t. 274* was not published in 1791 (as certainly are t. 1-100) but at the earliest in 1792. This has been stated first by O. Kuntze (Rev. Gen. 1: CXXXIII. 1891; ibid. 3(2): 156. 1898). Consequently *Erythrospermum* was considered to be a later taxonomical synonym of *Pectinea* by Post & Kuntze, Lex. Gen. Phan. 420. 1904, but no other author has followed them.

The reasons why such a relatively small genus as *Erythrospermum* Lamarck is proposed for conservation are as follows:

1. The name *Erythrospermum* Lamarck has been adopted up to now by all taxonomists working with the Flacourtiaceae.

2. *Erythrospermum* Lamarck has become the base for the tribe Erythrospermeae DC. Prodr. 1: 257. 1824, a name which has been used since then, being the oldest of the tribe; the name Oncobeae (Bentham 1861) used for the group by Gilg in Engler-Prantl, Nat. Pflanzenfam. 2. ed. 21: 393. 1925, is younger and originally does not include *Erythrospermum.*

3. No transfers have been made from *Erythrospermum* to *Pectinea* up till now.

Proposed by: H. Sleumer, Leiden.

(20) Proposal to conserve the generic name **Kopsia** Bl. (*Apocynaceae*) vs. *Kopsia* Dum. (*Orobanchaceae*).

Kopsia Bl. Cat. Gew. Buitenzorg, 12 (1823).

Holotype: *K. arborea* Bl. *l.c.* 13.

The genus is confined to tropical Asia and includes ten or twelve species, none of which has ever been referred to another genus, and for which no other generic name has been proposed, although *Calpicarpum* G. Don (1838) is a taxonomic synonym.

The name appears to have been adopted by all authors; a selection of references through the last century is as follows:

Miq. Fl. Ned. Ind. 2: 410 (1857); Benth. in Benth. et Hook. f. Gen. Pl. 2: 701 (1876); Hook. f. Fl. Brit. India, 3: 639 (1882); K. Schum. in Engl. et Prantl, Natürl. Pflanzenfam. 4 (2): 156 (1895); Koorders, Excursionsfl. Java, 3: 75 (1912); Ridley, Fl. Malay Penins. 2: 336 (1923); Merrill, Enum. Philipp. Pl. 3: 330 (1923), et Pl. Elmer. Born. in Univ. Calif. Publ. Bot. 15: 254 (1929); Pitard in Lecomte, Fl. Gén. Indo-Chine, 3: 1132 (1933); Craib, Fl. Siam. Enum. 2: 437 (1939).

Kopsia Dum. Comm. Bot. 16 (1822), et Fl. Belg. 34 (1827).

Lectotype: *K. ramosa* (Linn.) Dum. *l.c.* (*Orobanche ramosa* Linn.).*

Adopted by: — Reichb. Fl. Germ. Excurs. 356 (1831); Parlat. et Caruel, Fl. Ital. 5: 353 (1885); Bég. in Fiori et Paoletti, Fl. Anal. Ital. 2: 470 (1902); Bég. et Vacc. in Ann. Bot. Roma, 13: 29 (1914); O. Schwarz in Mitt. Thüring. Bot. Ges. 1: 117 (1949).

All the species which have been referred to *Kopsia* Dum. are European, and all have received binomials under *Orobanche* Linn., where they are usually placed.

It is noteworthy that in the second edition of the Italian Flora (Fiori, Nuova Fl. Ital. Anal. 2 (3), 379: 1926), *Kopsia* Dum. is reduced to sectional rank, whilst the only recent author who has maintained the genus *Kopsia* Dum. is O. Schwarz, who does so without comment. Beck, (Pflanzenreich, Orobanchaceae, 61: 1930) reduced it to the synonymy of *Orobanche* Linn. Sect. *Trionychon* Wallr. (1822) and most modern botanists will be content to leave it there.

In these circumstances there seems to be no advantage in providing a new name for *Kopsia* Bl., and its conservation is therefore proposed. —

Proposed by: A. A. Bullock, Kew.

---

* Selected here, out of four species definitely assigned to *Kopsia* by Dumortier, on account of the branched habit, whereas the other species are said (by Dumortier) to have simple or subsimple stems. — A.A.B.

(21) Proposal to conserve the generic name 2428 **Anredera** Juss. 1789 against *Fallopia* Adans. 1763 (*Basellaceae*).

Anredera Juss. Gen. 84. 1789, nom. cons. prop.

Type species: *Polygonum scandens* L. Sp. Pl. 1: 364. 1753. (*A. scandens* (L.) Moq.) (type specimen in the Linnean herbarium, cf. Fawcett & Rendle, Fl. Jam. 3, 1: 174. 1914).

Area: South America.

Species: Often considered monotypic, by Baillon and in the Fl. Mal. merged with *Boussingaultia* H.B.K. and comprising c. 5-10 species. The type species is a very well known ornamental, cultivated and introduced throughout the tropics and frequently found in greenhouses.

Fallopia Adans. Fam. 2: 277, 557. 1763, nom. rej. prop., non *Fallopia* Lour. 1790 (*Tiliaceae*).

Type species: *Polygonum scandens* L. l.c.

Species: none proposed.

Discussion: *Fallopia* Adans. has by Ind. Kew and by De Dalla Torre & Harms erroneously been reduced to *Brunnichia* Banks (*Polygonaceae*), as Adanson typified it with the Linnean species which is also the type of *Anredera*. Nomenclatorally *Anredera* is therefore an illegitimate name. *Fallopia* Adans. has, however, never come into use and we cannot find it employed by later authors. Instead *Anredera* has become a well-established generic name, widely known in handbooks, floras, and horticultural works. It would therefore be very unfortunate to replace it by reviving an entirely obsolete generic name necessitating a number of new combinations. The reviving of *Fallopia* would be specially unsatisfactory as Adanson apparently had no adequate idea of the plant he described: in his description he mentions a number of characters (cymes of 3 flowers, seed triangular, stamens 9) which do not belong to *Anredera* or any other *Basellaceae* but apparently to Polygonaceae. These discrepancies originated apparently from his pre-linnean references (Plukenet, Sloane).

Nomenclatorally, however, the generic name *Fallopia* cannot be detached from the interpretation of the type to which Adanson refers.

Proposed by: R. C. Bakhuizen van den Brink Jr and C. G. G. J. van Steenis, Leiden.

(22) Proposal to conserve the generic name **Himantandra** Diels against *Galbulimima* Bailey (*Himantandraceae*).

Nomen conservandum: *Himantandra* F. v. Muell. ex Diels in Bot. Jahrb. 49: 164. 1912 [sphalm. "*Himatandra*"]. T.: *H. belgraveana* (F. v. Muell.) Diels (= *Eupomatia belgraveana* F. v. Muell.)

Nomen rejiciendum: *Galbulimima* F. M. Bailey in Queensl. Dep. Agr. Bot. Bull. 9: 5. 1894. T.: *G. baccata* F. M. Bailey.

Arguments for conservation: The generic name *Himantandra* first appears in botanical literature as a so-called "nomen provisorium" accompanying the description of the new species *Eupomatia belgraveana* F. v. Muell. from New Guinea (in Austral. Journ. Pharm. 2: 4. 1887 and in Bot. Centralbl. 30: 326. 1887). Three years later (in Pap. Pl. 2: 54. 1890) F. v. Mueller separated this species from the genus *Eupomatia* and created a new monotypic genus: He proposed the new binomial *Himantandra belgraveana* (F. v. Muell.) F. v. Muell. referring to the place of the original description of *Eupomatia belgraveana* F. v. Muell. Since the author in this place gave neither a generic nor specific description, neither the genus nor the new combination is validly published according to Art. 41 (I.C.B.N., 1956). The contrary view expressed by A. C. Smith (in Journ. Arnold Arb. 23: 367. 1942) appears not to be tenable if Art. 41 is literally interpreted.

The first author to supply a generic description and thus to validate the name *Himantandra* was Diels (in Bot. Jahrb. 49: 164. 1912) (= 1912a).

He rightly attributed the generic name to F. v. Mueller but underwent an orthographic error ("*Himatandra*") which was twice repeated (in Bot. Jahrb. 48, Beibl. 107: 11, 12. 1912 (= 1912b) and in Bot. Jahrb. 52: 185. 1915). Diels himself explicitly corrected this error (in Bot. Jahrb. 55: 128. 1917), but already in a previous publication (in Ber. Deutsch. Bot. Ges. 34: 758, 771-773. 1916) this author used the correct spelling "*Himantandra*". Taxonomically, the genus was regarded by Diels either as a member of the *Annonaceae* (1912a, 1915; see above) or of the *Eupomatiaceae* (1912b).

In 1894 F. M. Bailey (in Queensl. Dep. Agr. Bot. Bull. 9: 5. 1894) validly published the description of a new monotypic genus called *Galbulimima* based on the new species *G. baccata* from Queensland. The genus was placed by him in the family *Magnoliaceae*.

In 1917 Diels made the genus *Himantandra* the basis of a new family *Himantandraceae*

(in Bot. Jahrb. 55: 126. 1917). In the same publication he united the two monotypic genera *Himantandra* F. v. Muell. ex Diels (1912) and *Galbulimima* F. M. Bailey (1894) retaining the first of the two names for the combined genus and proposing the new combination *Himantandra baccata* (F. M. Bailey) Diels. This procedure was due to the fact that Diels (l.c. 131) erroneously considered the generic name *Himantandra* to be validly published already by F. v. Mueller in 1887. *)

Sprague (in Journ. Bot. 60: 137. 1922) did not accept Diels' view; he rightly adopted the name *Galbulimima* for the combined genus and proposed the new binomial *G. belgraveana* (F. v. Muell.) Sprague. One year later, after E. G. Baker and Norman had described further two new New Guinean species of *Himantandra* (*H. nitida* Bak. fil. et Norman; *H. parvifolia* Bak. fil. et Norman, in Journ. Bot. 61: Suppl. 2. 1923), Sprague immediately formed new combinations under *Galbulimima* (in Journ. Bot. 61: 200. 1923).

In spite of his correct interpretation Sprague's view was completely neglected or overseen by later authors. Since 1922/23 the name *Himantandra* has been employed throughout a great number of taxonomic and morphological publications, among them numerous text-books. Therefore the present authors hold, in order to avoid much confusion by the replacement of the well known name *Himantandra* by the very unknown name *Galbulimima*, the conservation of the name *Himantandra* to be important and necessary. The genus is significant beyond its size because of its position among the primitive ranalian groups (cf. I. W. Bailey, Ch. G. Nast, and A. C. Smith, "The Family Himantandraceae", in Journ. Arnold Arb. 24: 190-206. 1943).

Arguments against conservation: The genus has a restricted area (New Guinea, North Eastern Australia) and contains only four species. All the necessary combinations under the legitimate generic name *Galbulimima* have already been published (Sprague 1922, 1923; see above).

Proposed by: G. Buchheim (Berlin-Dahlem) and A. C. Smith (Washington).

*) It may be noted that no sooner than in 1935, at the Sixth International Botanical Congress held at Amsterdam, a special provision concerning "nomina provisoria" was incorporated into the International Rules of Botanical Nomenclature (cf. Chronica Botanica 12(1/2): 71. 1950, where the special case of *Himantandra* is mentioned).

ROYAL BOTANIC GARDENS KEW

Dr. G. Taylor, formerly Keeper of the Botany Department of the British Museum (Natural History), London, has become Director of the Royal Botanic Gardens, Kew on October 1st, 1956. The former Director, Sir Edward Salisbury, retired on September 30th.

BRITISH MUSEUM

Mr. J. E. Dandy has been appointed Keeper of the Botany Department of the British Museum (Natural History), London. Mr. Dandy is to succeed Dr. G. Taylor who has been appointed Director of the Royal Botanic Gardens, Kew, beginning October 1st, 1956.

IVAR TIDESTROM (1864—1956)

Ivar Tidestrom, Swedish-American botanist, author of the Flora of Utah and Nevada (1925) and senior author of a flora of Arizona and New Mexico (1941) died on 2 August at St. Petersburg, Florida, aged 91 years.

Tidestrom, who was born in Sweden (Hidinge, Närke) on 13 September 1864, emigrated to the United States in 1880. He took his doctor's degree at the Catholic University of Washington; for a considerable time he was an assistant at the Bureau for Plant Industry, Washington D.C. He is commemorated by the genus *Tidestromia* P. C. Standley (1916).

AMERICAN SOCIETY OF PLANT TAXONOMISTS

Robert F. Thorne, of the State University of Iowa, and Robert L. Wilbur, of North Carolina State College, shared the George R. Cooley Award of $ 500. for outstanding papers published during 1955 on the flora of southeastern United States.

Dr. Thorne's paper, published in The American Midland Naturalist, is entitled "The Vascular Plants of Southwestern Georgia."

Dr. Wilbur's paper, published in Rhodora, is entitled "A Revision of the North American Genus *Sabatia* (Gentianaceae)."

The George R. Cooley Award of $ 100., for the outstanding paper presented before the Society at its annual meetings held in

conjunction with the meetings of the A.I.B.S. at Storrs, went to Henry J. Thompson, of the University of California at Los Angeles.

Dr. Thompson's paper was entitled "A Genetic Approach to the Taxonomy of *Mentzelia lindleyi*."

A.E.T.F.A.T.-INDEX 1955

L'A.E.T.F.A.T.-Index 1955 est sorti de presse. Conçu de la même façon que les précédents, il contient tout ce qui a paru durant l'année 1955 concernant la botanique systématique africaine et malgache prise au sens large. Cette année, pour la première fois, l'iconographie a été mentionnée.

L'A.E.T.F.A.T.-Index mentionne, en plus des taxa nouveaux, les divisions infraspécifiques, les basonymes des combinaisons nouvelles avec renvoi à la combinaison ainsi que de nombreuses références de révisions et de travaux intéressants au point de vue taxonomique.

Volume de près de 65 pages, cet Index contient près de 2.000 références rien que pour 1955!

On peut se le procurer de l'une des façons suivantes:

1. 100 francs belges à virer au compte chèque postal 6242.67 de l'A.E.T.F.A.T.-Index, Lab. Bot. Syst. U.L.B., 28, Av. P. Héger, Bruxelles, Belgique.
2. 800 francs français métropolitains à virer au compte chèque postal Paris 11.528-60 de M. D. Normand, 6, Boulevard Gambetta, Nogent-sur-Marne, Seine, France.
3. 15 shillings à virer par chèque ou mandat postal barré "a/c A.E.T.F.A.T." à M. A. A. Bullock, Royal Botanic Gardens, Kew, Richmond, Surrey, England.

* * *

We have pleasure in announcing the publication of the *A.E.T.F.A.T.-Index* 1955. This *Index* contains references to all that has been published during 1955 on the taxonomic botany in a wide sense of Africa and Madagascar. This year, for the first time, the iconography has been added.

The A.E.T.F.A.T.-Index lists new taxa, including infraspecific divisions, the basionyms of new combinations with references to the place of publication and it also gives references to revisions and papers of taxonomic interest.

This booklet of 65 pages contains nearly 2.000 references for 1955 only!

Copies can be ordered as follows:

1. 100 Belgian francs to be transferred to postal check account 6242.67 of A.E.T.F.A.T.-Index, Lab. Bot. Syst. U.L.B., 28, Av. P. Héger, Bruxelles, Belgique.
2. 800 French metropolitan francs to be transferred to postal check account Paris 11.528-60 of Mr. D. Normand, 6, Boulevard Gambetta, Nogent-sur-Marne, Seine, France.
3. 15 shillings to be transferred by either cheque or postal order crossed "a/c A.E.T.F.A.T." to Mr. A. A. Bullock, Royal Botanic Gardens, Kew, Richmond, Surrey, England.

NATIONAL FUNGUS COLLECTIONS

The Missouri Botanical Garden at St. Louis, Missouri, U.S.A. has given up the maintenance of its fungus herbarium exclusive of lichens due to the more pressing needs of other phrases of its activities. The Garden's materials in the mycological field have been acquired by The National Fungus Collections of the U.S. Department of Agriculture at Beltsville, Maryland. The herbarium containing approximately 100,000 specimens including many of the old and rare exsiccati will be integrated as rapidly as possible with the National Collections, but is now available for reference or study purposes as a separate unit.

John A. Stevenson

A MANUAL OF THE LEAFY HEPATICAE OF TROPICAL AMERICA

The National Science Foundation of the U.S.A. has awarded a Research Grant to the University of Cincinnati for the completion of The Manual of the Leafy Hepaticae of Tropical America. The project is directed by Dr. Margaret Fulford. She will be glad for information concerning collections of leafy Hepaticae from the New World tropics and will also be pleased to receive unnamed collections for determination. Correspondence should be addressed to Dr. Margaret Fulford, Dept. of Botany, University of Cincinnati, Cincinnati 21, Ohio., U.S.A.

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

The Division of Biological and Medical Sciences of the National Science Foundation announces that the next closing date for receipt of research proposals in the life sciences is January 15, 1957. Proposals received prior to that date will be reviewed at the Winter meetings of the Foundation's

advisory panels and disposition will be made approximately three months following the closing date. Proposals received after the January 15, 1957, closing date will be reviewed following the Spring closing date of May 15, 1957.

NATURHISTORISCHES MUSEUM WIEN

Dr. K. H. Rechinger, Direktor der Botanischen Abteilung des Naturhistorischen Museums in Wien I., Burgring 7, hat für die Zeit vom 1. Oktober 1956 bis 30. September 1957 eine Berufung als Gastprofessor an das University College of Arts and Sciences nach Baghdad (IRAQ) angenommen. Er wird während dieser Zeit durch Dr. Franz Petrak vertreten.

TEXAS RESEARCH FOUNDATION

On September 1, Dr. Donovan S. Correll joined the staff of the Texas Research Foundation, Renner, Texas, as Chief Botanist and Head of the Botanical Laboratory. He was formerly Principal Botanist in the Plant Introduction Section of the United States Department of Agriculture, Beltsville, Maryland. Dr. Correll, President of the American Horticultural Society, is to continue his monographic work on the wild tuber-bearing species of *Solanum* and plant resources investigations.

A DISAPPEARED PERIODICAL?

In the fifties and sixties of the last century a *General-Doubletten-Verzeichnis* was issued by the "Allgemeiner Tauschverein" in Leipzig. The German mycologist Auerswald published several new fungus-names in it and for nomenclatural reasons the publication is of importance.

However, it seems to be very rare to-day. Kindly assisted by some colleagues, I have asked for it in several large botanical libraries, in Europe and in the USA, but only a single year's number has been found (in the British Museum of Natural History). Before the last war it was of course to be found in Germany, in Leipzig at least, but I have now asked for it in vain in Berlin and Munich. It would be of value for the study of mycological nomenclature to trace this paper, and I should therefore be very grateful if information could be provided about existing copies and sent to the undersigned (Inst. of systematic Botany Univ. of Uppsala, Sweden) or to the International Bureau.

LENNART HOLM

VERATRUM

For his monographic study of *Veratrum* and allied genera in the *Liliaceae*, Mr. James H. Zimmerman, Dept. of Botany, University of Wisconsin, Madison 6, Wisconsin, would be most grateful to receive material (live plants, pickled flowers, or loans of pressed specimens) and information (observations in the field or studies of taxonomy, ecology, cytology) pertaining to species in the *Veratreae* from any part of the world.

ELIAS FRIES' AUTOBIOGRAPHY

The fiftieth anniversary of the founding of the Danish Mycological Society, October 1, 1955, was celebrated by the Society by publishing an annotated English translation of Elias Fries' autobiography, *Historiola studii mei mycologici*. This translation appeared in *Friesia*, Nordisk mykologisk Tidsskrift, vol. 5(2): 135-160. Reprints of this nicely presented and very abundantly illustrated paper are to be obtained from the Society (postal address: Roligheds vej 23, Köbenkavn V) at Dan. cr. 10.— per copy.

NOTICES OF BOOKS

Contributions to this column will be gratefully received by Mr. K. U. KRAMER, Botanical Museum, Lange Nieuwstraat 106, Utrecht, Netherlands.

Rubus in the Netherlands

W. BEYERINCK: *Rubi Neerlandici*. Bramen en Frambozen in Nederland, hun bouw, levenswijze, verwantschap, verspreiding en gebruik. 156 pp., 74 figs., 89 plates. Publ. as part 51 no. 1 of Verhand. Kon. Ned. Akad. Wetensch. afd. Natuurk. 2e reeks, Amsterdam, 1956. (Taxonomic revision, with notes on morphology, ecology, geography, and use. In Dutch, with English summary.)

Flora of Tasmania

W. M. CURTIS: The student's flora of Tasmania. Part I: Glossary, family keys, *Gymnospermae, Angiospermae: Ranunculaceae* to *Myrtaceae*. xlvii + 234 pp., 60 figs. Hobart, Tasmania, 1956. (With complete descriptions and keys, data on distribution, habitat, and use).

Coccoid Myxophyceae

F. DROUET & W. A. DAILY: Revision of the Coccoid *Myxophyceae*. 218 pp., 377

photographs. Publ. as vol. XII of Butler University Botanical Studies, Indianapolis, Ind., 1956. (With keys, descriptions, data on habitat, and extensive enumerations of specimens).

Drawings of British Plants

S. Ross-Craig: Drawings of British Plants. Part IX *Rosaceae* (2). London, 1956. (39 plates (drawings) of native British plants, *Alchemilla* to *Crataegus*).

Shrubs of Ontario

J. H. Soper, M. L. Heimburger & L. A. Garay: Twenty-five shrubs of Southern Ontario. Publ. by Conservation Branch of the Ontario Department of Planning and Development, Toronto, Ontario, 1956. (25 drawings, with distribution maps, descriptions, notes on habitat and range).

* * *

Monographs, revisions, etc., published in periodicals

R. S. Adamson: The South African species of *Aizoaceae*. III. *Galenia* L. Journ. S. Afr. Bot. 22(3): 87-127 (1956). (With key and descriptions).

A. H. G. Alston: The heterophyllous *Selaginellae* of continental North America. Bull. Brit. Mus. (Nat. Hist.) Botany 1(8): 219-274 (1955). 2 plates. (An enumeration with keys, includes all species occurring north of Colombia).

R. O. Belcher: A revision of the genus *Erechtites* (*Compositae*) with inquiries into *Senecio* and *Arrhenechthites*. Ann. Mo. Bot. Gard. 43(1): 1-85 (1956). (With keys to *Erechtites* and *Arrhenechthites*).

J. P. M. Brenan: The genus *Cola* in Kenya, Uganda and Tanganyika. Kew Bull. 1956 (1): 141-152 (With key).

J. A. Caro: Las especies de *Duranta* ("*Verbenaceae*") silvestres y cultivadas en la Republica Argentina. Rev. Arg. Agron. 23(1): 1-28 (1956). (With key, descriptions, 4 figs.).

J. de Carvalho e Vasconcellos & J. do Amaral Franco: Carvalhos de Portugal. Anais Inst. Sup. Agron. (Lisboa) 21: 1-135 (1954). (Revision of Portuguese species of Quercus, with key, drawings, and photographs). (For further notes, see the same authors' article in Notul. Syst. 15(2): 215-220 (1956) and the junior author's paper, ibid. p. 212-214).

M. A. Donk: Notes on resupinate Hymenomycetes — II. The tulasnelloid fungi. Reinwardtia 3(3): 363-379 (1956). (With key to genera).

F. E. Eckblad: The Gasteromycetes of Norway. The epigaean genera. Nytt Mag. f. Bot. 4: 19-86 (1955). (With keys and drawings).

L. L. Forman: The *Menispermaceae* of Malaysia: I. Kew Bull. 1956 (1): 41-70. (*Stephania* Loureiro, with key).

N. A. Gray: A taxonomic revision of *Podocarpus*. X. The South Pacific species of section *Eupodocarpus*, subsection D. Journ. Arn. Arbor. 37(2): 160-172 (1956).

R. Hakulinen: Die Flechtengattung *Candelariella* Müll. Arg. mit besonderer Berücksichtigung ihres Auftretens und ihrer Verbreitung in Fennoskandien. Ann. Bot. Soc. "Vanamo" 27(3): 1-127 (1954).

H. Hara: Critical notes on some type specimens of East-Asiatic plants in foreign herbaria, 1-7. Journ. Jap. Bot. 30(1): 19-26, (3): 65-72, (5): 138-142, (7): 193-198, (9): 271-278, (11): 321-327 (1955); 31(2): 57-63 (1956).

J. G. Hawkes: A revision of the tuber-bearing Solanums. Annual Rep. Scott. Soc. Res. Plant-Breeding: 37-109 (1956). (With keys and cytological data; includes wild and cultivated species).

P. Heinemann: Champignons récoltés au Congo Belge par M^me^ Goossens-Fontana. II. *Agaricus* Fries s.s. Bull. Jard. Bot. Brux. 26(1): 1-127 (1956). (With keys, descriptions, data on distribution; 42 figs.).

H. Humbert: Contributions à l'étude de la flore de Madagascar et des Comores (Fasc. 5). Notul. Syst. 15(2): 113-134 (1956). (With keys to *Heteromorpha* and *Apodocephala*).

J. Hunt: Taxonomy of the genus *Ceratocystis*. Lloydia 19(1): 1-58 (1956). (With key, descriptions, and illustrations).

H. A. Imshaug: Catalogue of Central American Lichens. The Bryologist 59(2): 69-114 (1956). (Arranged systematically; type localities are given for species described from Central America).

C. W. James: A revision of *Rhexia* (*Melastomataceae*). Brittonia 8(3): 201-230 (1956). (With key, descriptions, drawings, and distribution maps).

A. Lawalrée: Les *Biscutella* de Belgique. Bull. Jard. Bot. Brux. 26(1): 129-136 (1956).

K. N. G. Mac Leay: A preliminary list of the *Pteridophyta* of the Anglo-Egyptian Sudan. Webbia 11: 587-606 (1956). (An enumeration; 151 species are listed).

H. E. Moore, Jr., & F. R. Fosberg: The

palms of Micronesia and the Bonin Islands. Gentes Herbarum 8(6): Art. 20, 1956, pp. 421-478. (With keys, photographs, and drawings; includes cultivated species).

E. Nelmes: Notes on Cyperaceae 39. African species of *Scleria*, excluding sect. *Hypoporum*. Kew Bull. 1956 (1): 73-111 (With keys).

H. Romagnesi: Les Rhodophylles du Congo Belge d'après les récoltes de Mme Goossens-Fontana. Bull. Jard. Bot. Brux. 26(2): 137-182 (1956). (With key and drawings).

E. Rouleau: The genus *Dryas* (*Rosaceae*) in Newfoundland. Contr. Inst. Bot. Univ. Montréal 69: 5-24 (1956). (With key, 4 plates, and maps).

id.: A check-list of the vascular plants of the province of Newfoundland. Ibid.: 4-106. (An enumeration, with notes).

V. E. Rudd: The American species of *Aeschynomene*. Contrib. U.S. Nat. Herb. 32(1): 1-172 (1956). (With 10 figs. (maps); lists 67 species, several of them new, with keys, descriptions, and maps. Based on the material of only 12 herbaria, among which only 2 European ones).

H. Runemark: Studies in *Rhizocarpon*. I. Taxonomy of the yellow species in Europe. II. Distribution and ecology of the yellow species in Europe. Opera Bot. (Suppl. Botan. Notiser, Lund): 2: 1 & 2, 1956. (152 and 150 pp., with keys, descriptions, numerous figures and photographs, and distribution maps).

R. E. Schultes: *Orchidaceae Neotropicales* I. De Orchidaceis indigenis insularum Trinidad et Tobago notulae. Bot. Mus. Leafl. Harvard Univ. 17(7): 179-209 (1956). (With keys to *Dichaea* and *Notylia*; 7 plates).

J. L. van Soest: Les *Taraxacum* de Belgique — I. (Introduction et sections *Erythrosperma, Palustria* et *Spectabilia*). Bull. Jard. Bot. Brux. 26(2): 211-235 (1956). (With keys and illustrations).

M. Tardieu-Blot: Les genres "*Polystichopsis*" et "*Rumohra*" à Madagascar et aux Mascareignes. Notul. Syst. 15(2): 168-176 (1956). (With key to *Rumohra*).

M. D. Tindale: The *Cyatheaceae* of Australia. Contr. N.S. Wales Nat. Herb. 2(4): 327-361 (1956). (With keys, descriptions, and 7 plates).

Matériaux pour la flore de l'Oubangui-Chari. Ch. Tisserant: Crucifères, Nymphaeacées, Violacées, Renonculacées; Ch. Tisserant & R. Sillans: Capparidacées, Rosacées. Notul. Syst. 15(2): 183-212 (1956). (Enumerations with keys).

A. Zahlbruckner †: Flechtenflora von Java, 2. Teil. (Ed. by F. Mattick). Willdenowia 1(3): 433-528 (1956). (An enumeration, with keys; part 1 in Fedde Rep. Beih. 127, 1).

New periodicals

The Southwestern Naturalist, publ. by the Southwestern Association of Naturalists, four times a year, at Dallas, Tex. Includes papers dealing with general biology, zoology, botany, and reviews. The first issue (January, 1956) contains two taxonomic papers: H. A. Crum: Two new species of *Barbula* (*Musci*) from the Southwest; M. C. Johnston: *Ginoria davisii* (*Lythraceae*), a new species from Veracruz, Mexico.

Journal of the Faculty of Fisheries and Animal Husbandry, Hiroshima University. This journal, published at Fukuyama, Japan, though largely dealing with subjects related to fishery, will include some algological and other papers on marine botany. In the first issue (August, 1955): T. Fujiyama: On the life-history of *Prasiola japonica* Yatabe.

REGIONAL TREASURER GREAT BRITAIN

Our British Treasurer, Mr. A. A. Bullock, has asked to be relieved from his present duties in our Association. Mr. Bullock has served in this capacity since 1952 and in the period of his office our membership in the British Isles and the Commonwealth has more than doubled. There is no doubt that the major part of this increase is due to the energetic way in which Mr. Bullock handled our affairs. The Executive Committee of I.A.P.T. expresses its sincere thanks to him for the many time-consuming and important services rendered by him to our Association.

Mr. R. Ross has declared himself ready to act as our British Treasurer from September, 1st, 1956 onwards. The Executive Committee is very glad to welcome him to this post. Our members in Great Britain and the Commonwealth (except Canada) are request-

ed to send all their payments from now on to:

Mr. R. Ross, British Museum (Nat. Hist.), Cromwell Road, London S.W. 7.

It is essential to address all letters to Mr. R. Ross by name, for otherwise there will be delay and difficulty in delivering them within the Museum owing to the size of the staff and the number of organisations for which they provide honorary officers. Cheques, etc., should, however, be made payable to the International Association for Plant Taxonomy.

Bankers' orders need *not* to be changed. Payments made in this way will go on as before.

Members not paying by bankers' order are requested to take this possibility into consideration. This way of paying is the most efficient one for all parties concerned. Bankers' order forms will gladly be sent by Mr. Ross.

F. A. Stafleu

CONTENTS

September-October 1956 (no. 7)

FURTADO, C. X. — "Illegitimate" names under the Rules 149

STEARN, W. T. — Further information about Kunth's 'Nova Genera et Species Plantarum' and 'Mimoses' . . 153

STEENIS, C. G. G. J. VAN — Diatoms as tracers to localize erroneously labelled specimens 157

PAPENFUSS, G. F. — On the Nomenclature of some Delesseriaceae . . 158

MCVAUGH, R. — Nomenclatural notes on Myrtaceae and some related families (continuation) 162

BOUREAU, E. — Paléobotanistes du Monde 168

November 1956 (no. 8)

ROSS, R. and F. A. STAFLEU — Illegitimacy and valid publication 181

CELARIER, R. P. and J. R. HARLAN — An Andropogoneae garden in Oklahoma 183

DAYTON, W. A. — A few comments on the International Code of Nomenclature for Cultivated Plants . . . 186

FLORIN, R. — Nomenclatural notes on genera of living gymnosperms . . . 188

SLEUMER, H. — Note on the genus *Guidonia* Plumier 192

TRAUB, H. P. — The holotype of *Hymenocallis palmeri* 195

News and Notes

Nomina conservanda proposita

[(14) *Leptospermum* J. R. et G. Forster . . . . . 162]

[(15) *Myrteola* Berg . . . . . 163]

[(16) *Syzygium* Gaertner . . . . 164]

[(17) *Samyda* Jacquin . . . . . 194]

[(18) *Guarea* Linnaeus . . . . . 194]

(19) *Erythrospermum* Lamarck . 197

(20) *Kopsia* Blume 197

(21) *Anredera* Jussieu 198

(22) *Himantandra* Diels 198

Royal Botanic Gardens, Kew . . . 199

British Museum 199

Ivar Tidestrom (1864-1956) 199

American Society of Plant Taxonomists 199

A.E.T.F.A.T.-Index 1955 200

National Fungus Collections (J. A. Stevenson) 200

A manual of the leafy Hepaticae of Tropical America 200

National Science Foundation . . . 200

Naturhistorisches Museum, Wien . . 201

Texas Research Foundation 201

A disappeared periodical? 201

Veratrum 201

Elias Fries' autobiography 201

Notices of Books 201

Regional Treasurer Great Britain . . 203

Contents 204

"Taxon" is directed by: Prof. J. Lanjouw, Chief Editor, and Dr. F. A. Stafleu, Assistant Editor. All correspondence should be sent to the International Bureau for Plant Taxonomy and Nomenclature, 106 Lange Nieuwstraat, Utrecht — Netherlands.

All members of I.A.P.T. receive "Taxon" free of charge. Copies of personal members are for private use only and should not be placed in official libraries.

Published 30 Oct. 1956